IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Re application:

Morris E. Lewis Attorney Docket: LEWIS

Application Number: 09/339,059

Art Unit: 362§

Examiner: Nicholas D. Rosen

For: METHOD, APPARATUS AND PROCESSES FOR MANUAL, AUTOMATIC OR REMOTE ONLINE PURCHASING AND LOCAL, REGIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL OVER THE COUNTER PURCHASING WITH REBATE, SAVING, AND INVESTING PROCESSES

REPLY TO OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

Honorable Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks Washington, D.C. 20231

In response to the Office Action Summary mailed April 12, 2002, please accept the attached comments. If there are any question, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

MORRIS E. LEWIS

APPLICANT

301-899-8925

Serial No: 09/339,059 Response to April 12, 2002 - Office Action Summary

Dear Mr. Rosen,

Please accept my response to your Office Action which was mailed to me on April 12, 2002. I responded to your comments and suggestions as I understood each one, however, I am available to answer any questions or discuss any issue you might have regarding my response. I must say that I did not find the prior art to be novel and obvious over my invention and I will try to bring forth my reasons for thinking so in the following response. I have followed your outline in responding and I have made major changes in the layout of the specifications as you have suggested.

Further, I did a very in-depth review of the prior art and found several things that I disagree with and I have compiled a comparison spreadsheet showing very briefly the differences and patentability of my invention over this prior art.

Additionally, I have attached "comparison spreadsheets" that will further bring forth the differences in inventions.

Theft of Trade Secrets

During one of our earlier conversations I believe you brought forth the possibility of an Interference. During the years of 1997-2000, I experienced major thefts of Trade Secrets relating to information in my patent applications. As such, I was forced to write my applications in such a manner as to enable all features and components, yet do so in a manner that could confuse the thieves.

Serial No: 09/339,059 Response to April 12, 2002 - Office Action Summary

In amending my application and in accordance with MPEP rules on enablement, amending and re-phasing, I have also been very careful in re-phasing my application and in bringing forth the enherent functions, theories etc while describing the enabled matter.

I very strongly believe that there are pending applications which contain this stolen matter, therefore, I respectfully request your assistance in bringing forth any information that could help locate these applications.

The Theft of Trade Secrets is a Federal crime that could result in very severe penalties to include fifteen (15) years imprisonment As such, I have made reports on the stolen matter to appropriate Law Enforcement agencies and now we are waiting for the stolen information to surface, whereupon, we will push for prosecution of the thieves and all who conspired with them.